

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

SOURCE SELECTION PLAN (SSP)  
FOR THE

MULTIPLE AWARD TASK ORDER CONSTRUCTION  
CONTRACT, MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

RFP NO. DACA31-99-R-0055

July 14, 1999

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-1

Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

PREPARED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
                  SUSAN L. HANLE  
                  Contract Specialist  
                  Contracting Division

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

RECOMMEND APPROVAL: \_\_\_\_\_  
                                  Construction Division

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

RECOMMEND APPROVAL: \_\_\_\_\_  
                                  Office of Counsel

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-2

Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**FOREWARD**

This Multiple Award Task Order Construction Contract, Military District of Washington, (DACA31-99-R-0055) Source Selection Plan (SSP) defines the organization, responsibilities, evaluation factors and procedures to be followed by the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) in evaluating proposals and reporting the results to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for contract award. This SSP applies to proposals submitted in response to the Multiple Award Task Order Construction Contract, Military District of Washington, Request for Proposal (RFP) number DACA31-99-R-0055 released on 19 May 1999.

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
PATRICIA A. ADAMS  
Contracting Officer  
Source Selection Authority

CONCUR:

\_\_\_\_\_  
JEROME T. RIFKIN  
Ch, Contracting Division

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-3

Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**1.0 Nature and Scope of the Acquisition**

**1.1 Description of the Effort**

The contractor shall provide all management, supervision, labor, materials, tools and equipment necessary to perform construction of new facilities, and repair/modify existing facilities, utilities, and site work. The Contractor shall be required to work at sites in Baltimore district consisting of areas within the Washington, D.C. Beltway and include an area 20 miles outside of the Washington, DC beltway and include the area south of the Potomac River, north of the Occoquan River. The locations of work include installations under the Military District of Washington to include but are not limited to Ft. Belvoir, Ft. Myer, Ft. McNair, Ft. AP Hill, Ft Meade, Walter Reed Army Medical Center and other military, government and institutional sites within this area. The contractor shall provide construction services as requested in the task orders issued under this contract. This is an indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contract encompassing a variety of repair, modifications and new construction work. Examples of these projects include schools, office buildings, housing, roads, utilities, roofing repair, as well as a variety of mechanical/electrical upgrades. This contract will be administered by the Baltimore District Corps of Engineers for both Federal and non-Federal customers. All task orders will be negotiated firm fixed price

**1.2 Acquisition Strategy**

The Multiple Award Task Order Construction acquisition and source selection is being conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15. The Government intends to award two firm fixed price indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity task order construction contracts.

The target value of each contract will be \$7,450,000. Both contracts will be issued with a combined aggregate capacity of \$14,900,000. This includes a Base period not to exceed twelve (12) months and two (2) one-year option periods. The base period and all options shall not exceed 36 months, or the \$14,900,000 combined aggregate capacity of both contracts, whichever comes first.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

The scope of services shall be negotiated fixed priced construction task orders. Upon notice from the Contracting Officer or Contracting Officer's Authorized Representative of a requirement, the Contractor shall submit a price proposal to the Government for each potential task order. The proposal submitted by the Contractor shall be a detailed proposal comprised of a breakdown of labor, material and equipment quantities and costs. This breakdown shall also be required for any subcontractors. The construction task order price will be computed using established "R.S.MEANS" cost Data and/or negotiated line items multiplied by the appropriate "coefficient" identified in the bid schedule. Unit and assembly line items from R.S. Means' "Facility Construction Cost Data" will be used. This book is available from the following source:

R.S. MEANS COMPANY  
100 CONSTRUCTION PLAZA  
P.O. BOX 800  
KINGSTON, MA. 02364-0800  
1-800-448-8182

When agreed to by both the Government and the Contractor; specific "unit" and "assembly" line items may be used from the following R.S. Means Publications: "Assembly Cost Data", "Building Construction Cost Data", "Concrete and Masonry Cost Data", "Mechanical", "Electrical", "Site Work", "Repair and Remodeling", "Heavy Construction", "Concrete", "Landscaping". The loaded costs of labor, material and equipment will be used. The contractor should assume that the majority of the work will be performed in the Washington D.C. / Fort Belvoir, VA area and consider that some work may occur in the Fort Meade, MD area. The proposed cost coefficient should allow for the Davis-Bacon labor wages for these areas and consider any and all adjustments necessary in the Means city cost index. After contract award, no adjustments for city cost index or labor rate will be allowed.

There are no known small business or small disadvantaged business concerns capable of satisfying, as a prime contractor, the requirements for this acquisition. However, the Government intends to require the selected prime contractor to establish a small and small disadvantaged business subcontracting plan in accordance with FAR Part 19.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**1.3 Source Selection Milestones**

|                                 |           |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| CBD Notice Issued               | 29 Apr 99 |
| RFP Issued                      | 19 May 99 |
| Pre-Proposal Conference         | 17 Jun 99 |
| Proposals Received              | 19 Jul 99 |
| Evaluations Begin               | 26 Jul 99 |
| Competitive Range               | 02 Aug 99 |
| POM                             | 04 Aug 99 |
| Negotiations                    | 09 Aug 99 |
| FPRs Requested                  | 13 Aug 99 |
| FPRs Received                   | 20 Aug 99 |
| Final Evaluations Begin         | 23 Aug 99 |
| Final Evaluations Complete      | 26 Aug 99 |
| SSEB Evaluation Report Complete | 30 Aug 99 |
| SSA Analysis and Recommendation | 03 Sep 99 |
| SSA Determination               | 08 Sep 99 |
| PNM                             | 13 Sep 99 |
| Award                           | 17 Sep 99 |

**1.4 Plan Content**

Section 2 of this Source Selection Plan (SSP) identifies the organizations participating in this source selection. It describes the roles and responsibilities of the Source Selection Authority (SSA), Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB), and the Cost and Technical Evaluation Committees (CEC/TEC) that will perform the actual evaluation. Section 3 presents the evaluation process. This section describes how proposals will be distributed among committee members, the initial screening process and the process leading to a recommended source. Section 4 contains the evaluation factors, subfactors, and evaluation criteria. It identifies the ranking descriptors and criteria to be applied against them and the relative importance of this criteria. Section 5 presents a discussion of Best Value and offers a suggested method of determining Best Value for this acquisition. The necessity to safeguard source selection information is discussed in Section 6, along with an approach to document the contract for procurement sensitive material.

The SSP is supported by a set of Appendices containing mandatory certifications for source selection participants and formats for evaluation reports.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**2.0 Source Selection Organization and Responsibilities**

**2.1 Source Selection Authority (SSA)**

The final source selection decision will be made by the SSA, based on the results of the proposal evaluations and recommendation of the SSEB. The SSA for this acquisition is Ms. Patricia A. Adams, Acting Chief, Contracts Team, Contracting Division, Baltimore District, Corps of Engineers.

The SSA is responsible to:

- Establish an evaluation team tailored for the particular acquisition, that includes appropriate contracting, legal, logistics, technical and other expertise to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of offers;
- Approve the source selection strategy or acquisition plan, if applicable;
- Ensure consistency among the solicitation requirements, notices to offerors, proposal preparation instructions, evaluation factors and subfactors; solicitation provisions or contract clauses, and data requirements;
- Consider the recommendations of advisory boards or panels (if any) and;
- Select the source whose proposal is most advantageous to the government, price and other factors considered.
- Review and approve the evaluation criteria and standards;
- Review and approve the necessary weights of the evaluation criteria;
- Approve the membership of the SSEB and ensure that members are properly trained. Ensure that personnel resources and time devoted to the source selection are not excessive in relation to the complexity of the program.
- Review SSEB Evaluation Report

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**2.2 Contracting Officer (KO)**

The KO oversees the regulatory process, ensures compliance with the FAR, DoD FAR Supplement (DFARS), Army FAR Supplement (AFARS), Engineer FAR Supplement (EFARS) and other relevant regulations and acts as staff advisor to the SSA and SSEB. A major responsibility is to ensure that the evaluation criteria set forth in the SSP are properly addressed in the RFP. The Contracting Officer for this Acquisition is Ms. Patricia A. Adams, Acting Chief, Contracts Team, Contracts Branch, Contracting Division, Baltimore District, Corps of Engineers. Other specific KO duties are to:

- After release of a solicitation; serve as the focal point for inquiries from actual or prospective offerors;
- After receipt of proposals, control exchanges with offerors in accordance with FAR 15.306;
- Make the competitive range recommendation;
- Decide whether to conduct discussions and how to conduct them;
- Review evaluation reports;
- Responsible for contract terms, conditions, and pricing;
- Conduct negotiations;
- Award the contract;
- Oversee preparation of the contract award documents, including Pre-Negotiation Objective Memorandum and Post Negotiation Memorandum;
- Conduct debriefings for the offerors.

**2.3 Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB)**

The primary responsibility of the SSEB is to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of each offeror's proposal submitted in response to the Multiple Award Task Order Construction RFP in accordance with the SSP and the evaluation factors contained in the solicitation in order to identify the offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The SSEB should be composed of personnel familiar with the operations requirements and environment of the project. The SSEB will be lead by an SSEB Chairperson and will consist of three components: a Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC), a Cost Evaluation Committee (CEC), and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan Evaluation Committee. The TEC will not have access to cost



**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

data, during the evaluation process. Each team will be staffed with personnel with expertise in the designated area and will be headed by a Chairperson responsible for the committee's overall performance. The evaluation committees may be supported by non-voting Government advisor members serving as technical advisors or consultants on specific topics. The SSEB shall be headed by an SSEB Chairperson, who shall report to the SSA. The SSEB shall:

- Maintain a full commitment to the evaluation process until the evaluation is complete and the decision is released by the SSA;
- Conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the competitive proposals in an impartial and equitable manner. The Chairperson supervises and directs all activities of the SSEB in accordance with this plan;
- Evaluate proposals using only the information available in the proposals;
- Evaluate each proposal against the established evaluation criteria only (it is improper for the SSEB to compare proposals against one another);
- Identify and fully document proposal strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, and clarifications on the Evaluators Score Sheet as well as provide an overall assessment of each assigned proposal;
- Participate in and/or assist in pre-award discussion and post-award debriefings of unsuccessful offerors, as required by the KO.
- Prepare the source selection decision document for the SSA's signature, if requested by the SSA.

**2.3.1 SSEB Chairperson Responsibilities**

The SSEB Chairperson appointed to lead the proposal evaluation effort for the Multiple Award Task Order Construction RFP will function as a working member of the board and will:

- Manage the overall activities of the SSEB, distributing the workload and assigning tasks to the SSEB Committees, and ensuring compliance with source selection information security procedures;
- Ensure all SSEB members are duly appointed and confirmed by memorandum and that all necessary procurement

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

- integrity certifications, statements of non-disclosure, and rules of conduct are executed by SSEB members;
- Ensure all SSEB members are fully trained prior to start of evaluation, including any replacement SSEB members;
  - Ensure all SSEB members understand the evaluation objectives, procedures, schedules, and individual committee member responsibilities;
  - Review, coordinate, and reconcile consensus evaluations by the individual SSEB committees;
  - Provide KO with evaluation report prior to competitive range determination and discussions;
  - Provide consensus on recommendations to the SSA;
  - Service as the focal point for coordination and consultation with the SSA;
  - Prepare SSEB reports and recommendations to the SSA; ensure adequacy and overall quality of the narrative justification for the evaluation results;
  - Coordinate technical participation for discussions with offerors and debriefings, as directed by the KO, and other activities as required;
  - Provide KO with all evaluation documentation for the contract file;
  - Prepare lessons learned report, if requested by the SSA.

**Committee Chairpersons' Responsibilities**

- Manage the day-to-day activities of the evaluation team, distributing the workload and assigning tasks to the team members;
- Serve as focal point for coordination and consultation with the SSEB Chairperson;
- Review, coordinate, and reconcile evaluations by the individual committee members; review supporting documentation for individual evaluations;
- Facilitate consensus discussions among team members;
- Provide Consensus Evaluation Report, with supporting documentation to the SSEB Chairperson.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**2.3.2 Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)**

The TEC will be responsible for determining how well proposals satisfy the technical criteria of the Multiple Award Task Order Construction RFP. This will be accomplished by reading all proposals and rating each of them against the technical evaluation factors specified in the RFP, in accordance with the ranking and scoring methodology described in Section 4 of this SSP. The TEC Chairperson will be responsible for preparing a written report, to the SSEB Chairperson, documenting the results of the TEC evaluations.

**2.3.3 Cost Evaluation Committee (CEC)**

The CEC, consisting of representatives chosen for their specific cost evaluation expertise and experience is tasked to perform a comprehensive evaluation of the cost information provided in response to the proposal requirements. The CEC has the primary responsibility for assessing the completeness and reasonableness of the offerors' cost proposals. The CEC is composed of appropriate personnel from Contracting, Engineering, Construction, PPMD, Contracting, and others as deemed appropriate.

**2.3.4 Small Business Evaluation Committee (SBEC)**

The Small Business Evaluation Committee (SBEC) will review the offerors' subcontracting plans and evaluate them for compliance with statutory requirements of Public Laws 95-507-, 99-661, and 100-656. The plans shall provide comprehensive responses to the requirements of the clause entitled "Small Business and Small Disadvantaged and Women-Owned Small Business Subcontract Plan" (FAR 52.219-9). The plan, as a minimum, shall include a detailed discussion of the elements set forth in FAR Clause 52.519-9(d)(1) through (11). The subcontract plans in the competitive range will be evaluated in compliance with the mandates of Congress and FAR 19.7, and AFARS 19.7 (AL-93-10) to increase opportunities for small, disadvantaged and women owned small businesses.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**2.4 Advisors and Consultants**

The source selection process may require the use of advisors to assist in the process. Advisors are Government personnel made available to assist the SSA and SSEB but do not participate in the actual evaluation. Advisors may include Government contracting, legal, construction or engineering personnel with the approval of the SSA. Non-Government personnel will not act as advisors or consultants and will not participate in the source selection process.

**2.5 Duration and Location of the Evaluation**

The SSEB evaluating the Multiple Award Task Order Construction Contract, Military District of Washington proposals are expected to require approximately one week to accomplish their tasks. This estimate is subject to change as a function of the number of proposals submitted. The TEC members will remain available and committed until all evaluation and source selection actions have been completed.

All TEC members will be required to be present at the evaluation location during normal duty hours. Depending on the number of proposals received, overtime after normal duty hours, weekends and holiday work may be necessary. Annual leave during the evaluation process shall not be permitted unless granted by the SSEB Chairperson. Any requirement for overtime, weekends, etc., will be determined by the SSEB Chairperson. Only the SSEB Chairperson or SSA is authorized to release an SSEB member from the evaluation proceedings.

**3.0 Proposal Evaluation Process**

The purpose of the evaluation process is to provide critical input to the source selection process by providing a rational basis for selection of the offeror who submits the proposal deemed most likely to successfully accomplish the project, price and other factors considered. Evaluators will not compare one proposal against another, but rather evaluate each proposal against the factors stated in the RFP and how well it meets the criteria established for the proposal evaluation. The evaluation process provides the necessary analysis and recommendation to the SSA for the final decision as to which proposal offers the best value to satisfy the needs of the Government.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

### **3.1 Preparation and Training**

There are several functions that must be performed prior to initiation of the actual evaluation process.

- The evaluation strategy and criteria, as contained in this Source Selection Plan (SSP), must be identified and approved by the SSA.
- Personnel participating in the SSEB must be identified and notified.
- Participants in the source selection must sign non-disclosure and other related statements that become part of the official supporting documentation (See Appendix A)
- Participants in the source selection will read the RFP to become thoroughly familiar with the project requirements. Participants will also familiarize themselves with the RFP format and content requirements as set forth in Section 00100 of the RFP and the contents of this SSP. Any questions concerning the RFP requirements, evaluation process, or criteria should be directed to the SSEB Chairperson or KO for resolution.
- Evaluation committee members must acquire a thorough knowledge and understanding of the evaluation factors (RFP Section 00100) and associated criteria and how they are applied.

### **3.2 Proposal Evaluation**

The TEC and CEC evaluators will separately and concurrently review and evaluate their respective portion of each offeror's proposal. The review will be based on the factors for award and evaluation criteria and instructions stated in the RFP and contained in Section 4 of this SSP. Evaluators will assess each proposal and prepare a narrative description of the strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, and areas requiring clarification to support the rating assigned to the proposal as well as areas requiring clarification.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**3.2.1 Technical Evaluations**

**3.2.1.1 Initial Technical Evaluations**

The TEC will be responsible for determining how well proposals satisfy the technical criteria of the Multiple Award Task Order Construction RFP. This will be accomplished by reading all proposals and rating each of them against the technical evaluation factors specified in the RFP, in accordance with the ranking and scoring methodology described in Section 4 of this SSP. Each TEC member will evaluate the technical proposals in their entirety and qualitatively score the proposals on the individual evaluation sheets provided as an attachment to this document. Comments on deficient areas as well as comments on satisfactory and superior elements of each factor shall be recorded on each evaluator's evaluation sheet. Following individual evaluations, the TEC will meet and each TEC member will discuss their respective qualitative ratings and the TEC will reach consensus qualitative rating on each factor and sub-factor. The consensus will be developed as a result of discussions based on subjective rationale. The consensus score will not be developed by utilizing a formula, by averaging, or by voting. The initial technical consensus results for each offeror will be recorded on a set of summary evaluation sheets. Detailed narrative comments on the advantages and disadvantages to support each consensus rating will be documented on the summary evaluation sheets.

The TEC will provide a qualitative rating and narrative on the factors that directly or indirectly affect the contractor's ability to perform the technical task being evaluated. Questions for the offeror will also be noted. Detailed comments are important for discussion purposes and debriefing the unsuccessful offerors after award. In a consensus score cannot be obtained through deliberation, a non-consensus report may be prepared by the chairperson and forwarded to determination/approval through the SSEB to SSA.

A Summary Technical Report documenting the results of the initial technical evaluation will be written by the Chairman of the TEC at the conclusion of the evaluations. The report will be forwarded to the Chairperson of the SSEB.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**3.2.1.2 Final Technical Evaluations**

The TEC will review any clarifications and/or changes to the technical proposals and adjust their evaluations as appropriate. The TEC will use the same approach as described above in Initial Technical Evaluations, culminating with a Final Summary Technical Report.

**3.2.2 Cost Evaluations**

**3.2.2.1 Initial Cost Evaluations**

In accordance with FAR 15.8, the CEC will independently evaluate each Offeror's cost information. As set forth in AFARS 15.608, cost will be evaluated but not scored or combined with other aspects of the proposal evaluation. The cost proposals will be evaluated by the CEC for cost realism (reasonableness, allowability, allocability) accuracy, and currency of data. Technical advisors to the CEC may be consulted as necessary to ensure that the proposed cost elements are reasonable.

Each CEC member will evaluate each cost proposal in its entirety. Each evaluator will document, in a detailed narrative format, the merits and shortcomings of each proposal. Following individual evaluations of each proposal, the CEC will meet and each CEC member will discuss their findings for each proposal.

In addition to assessing cost proposals, the CEC is responsible for providing a written summary report of each proposal to the KO, through the SSEB to facilitate the KO's competitive range determination. The CEC may participate in written and oral pre-award discussions with offerors and post award debriefings of unsuccessful offerors, as required by the KO.

**3.2.2.2 Final Cost Evaluations**

The CEC will review any changes to the cost portion of the proposals and adjust their evaluations as appropriate. The CEC will use the same approach as described above in Initial Cost Evaluations, culminating with a Final Summary Cost Report.

The affordability and value of the proposed cost data must be evident and well documented. Additionally, the rationale used in determining the cost information reasonableness or unreasonableness must be very well documented. Narratives with

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

examples of cost discrepancies as well as examples of the Offeror's clear understanding of segments of the work are required in the Summary Cost Report.

### 3.3 Definitions

A strength is defined as an aspect of the proposal that meets or exceeds an RFP requirement.

A weakness is defined as a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (FAR 15.301).

A significant weakness is defined as a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (FAR 15.301).

A deficiency is defined as a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level (FAR 15.301).

A clarification is defined as limited exchanges between the Government and offerors, that may occur when award without discussions is contemplated (FAR 15.306).

Communications are defined as exchanges between the Government and offerors, after receipt of proposals, leading to establishment of the competitive range. Communications are limited to those offerors whose past performance information is the determining factor preventing them from being placed within the competitive range, or with those offerors whose exclusion from, or inclusion in, the competitive range is uncertain (FAR 15.306(b)).

Exchanges with offerors after establishment of the competitive range are called discussions. Discussions are tailored to each offeror's proposal and shall be conducted by the KO with each offeror within the competitive range.



**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**3.4 Competitive Range Determination**

Following the initial technical and cost evaluations, the KO may make a competitive range determination. The competitive range shall be determined on the basis of cost or price and other factors that are stated in the solicitation and shall include all proposals that have a reasonable chance of being selected for award.

The SSEB will review the Contracting Officer's competitive range determination, and present their recommendation to the SSA. After considering all information accumulated in the rating and ranking processes conducted by the SSEB, the SSA will approve the Contracting Officer's competitive range determination. When approved by the SSA, the KO may hold discussions with those offerors as necessary.

**3.5 Discussions**

Members of the SSEB shall not communicate directly with offerors. All communications (clarifications/questions) will be submitted through the KO for review and transmittal to the offeror. All members of the SSEB will, when necessary, assist the KO in refining discussion items and support contract negotiations. Discussions may lead to amended proposals that will require further evaluation.

**3.6 Final Proposal Revisions (FPR)**

The KO may request or allow proposal revisions to clarify and document understandings reached during negotiations. At the conclusion of discussions, each offeror still in the competitive range shall be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal revision. When FPRs are called for, the SSEB will be required to review these submissions, reassess their evaluations of affected proposal areas, and modify their ratings if warranted by proposal changes. Subsequent requests for FPRs, if necessary, shall be approved by the SSA.

**3.7 Source Selection Documentation**

It is extremely important that the source selection process is adequately documented, both to substantiate and provide an audit trail for the source selection decision and support that decision against possible protests by unsuccessful offerors. The evaluations will be documented in individual evaluation reports

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

prepared by the TEC members which includes the evaluator's score sheets including a list of strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and clarifications, as applicable. The evaluations will also be documented in the TEC consensus evaluation report which will include a list of strengths, weaknesses, or deficiencies supporting the consensus team score of each proposal.

The SSEB will review the TEC and CEC Reports and prepare a final Comparative Analysis Report recommending a source. All source selection reports will be reviewed by the Contracting Officer prior to submission to the SSA.

**3.7.1 Individual Evaluator's Score Sheets (for initial and final evaluations)**

Each member of the SSEB will be required to justify and thoroughly document their assessment of the proposals evaluated by them. The narrative portion of the individual Evaluator's Score Sheets (See Appendix B) will discuss the strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, and areas requiring clarifications, by evaluation factor based upon rigorous analysis of the offeror's ability to satisfy the RFP requirements. Each member of the TEC will address the evaluation factors in the solicitation, pointing out the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies, and areas requiring clarification of each proposal vis-à-vis the evaluation criteria. These individual reports will be used by the Chairperson to prepare the Consensus (Committee) Evaluation Reports.

**3.7.2 Consensus (Committee) Evaluation Reports (for initial and final evaluations)**

Following discussions among individual members of each committee to reach a consensus score, the SSEB Committee Chairpersons will each prepare a consensus evaluation report that will document the evaluator's consensus rating and will include a listing of consensus strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and/or areas requiring clarification. The SSEB Chairperson shall provide the consensus evaluation report to the KO following the initial evaluation for use in determining the competitive range, as required.

When the final technical and cost evaluations are completed, the TEC and CEC Chairpersons will present each committee's results in a final consensus evaluation report to the SSEB

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

Chairperson for review, approval and preparation of the SSEB Comparative Analysis Report.

**3.7.3 SSEB Chairperson Comparative Analysis Report**

Upon receipt of the final consensus evaluation reports, the SSEB shall prepare a comparative analysis report. The comparative analysis report shall provide the consensus evaluation of each proposal in a summary matrix format which includes the consensus evaluation reports and individual evaluators' score sheets as supporting documentation. The comparative analysis report shall provide the SSA all information necessary to make a source selection decision. The SSEB may also recommend a source, if so requested by the SSA, in the comparative analysis report.

The KO, and attorney advisor shall review the comparative analysis report including the final consensus evaluation reports. Upon approval by the KO, the comparative analysis report will be forwarded to the SSA.

**3.7.4 SSA Decision Documentation**

The SSA shall prepare the source selection decision documentation. The source selection decision shall be fully justified in a stand-alone document which shall address the following: how the selected offeror was rated with regard to each first tier evaluation factor and why this offer was selected by application of the first tier evaluation factors. This discussion should generally be limited to the first-tier evaluation factors, but may go into sub-tier factors to the extent necessary to adequately document the decision. The source selection document is potentially releasable under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). As a result, information that is exempt from the FOIA shall not be included in the document. The source selection document shall be reviewed by the KO, and attorney advisor prior to signature by the SSA.

**4.0 Evaluation Scoring and Factors**

4.1 All proposals shall be evaluated by the SSEB in accordance with the criteria, factors, and subfactors as established in Section 00100 of the Multiple Award Task Order Construction Contract, Military District of Washington RFP. The award will be made to the offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government, price and other factors considered. The

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

evaluation criteria provides for accomplishment of the technical, cost and small business subcontracting evaluations based upon standards established before receipt of the proposals and is intended to ensure that the evaluation will be a structured process employing equitable measures.

4.1.1 Technical proposals shall be evaluated based on an adjectival rating system (cost proposals will not be scored).

4.1.2 It should be noted that the SSEB will allocate points for each factor based on the consensus adjectival ratings given by the TEC. A predetermined range of multipliers (based on potential costs vs. risks, and on premium performance vs. additional costs) was derived by the SSEB. These coefficients will be multiplied by the maximum number of points allocable to that factor to determine the actual factor point score. As with the factor point value, the TEC will not be made aware of these coefficient values. Although these coefficients will increase as the ratings go from "U" to "E", their value from zero to unity may or may not progress linearly (i.e. the "delta" between adjectival ratings may or may not be equal). Therefore a "marginal" may be equal to, less than or greater than one half that of a "satisfactory" rating.

4.1.3 It is imperative that a detailed coherent narrative be generated for each of the factors evaluated. As with the qualitative rating, the narrative must address the rationale for that score, and must identify the strong points, weak points, and the impact of these various elements on the overall evaluation of the factor. The ratings have no credibility if they are not accompanied by a valid narrative. Also, these narratives will be used by the Chairman of the TEC as a basis for the report to the SSEB. The SSEB must consider both the numeric score and the narrative, in making their recommendation decision. It is their responsibility to make the final determination of the relative merits of the information presented to them. While the numeric score is certainly a valuable tool, it is often information contained within the narrative that ultimately is used to make the final award decision.

4.1.4 The completeness of the evaluation sheets and the TEC's report to the SSEB is the primary tool used to debrief unsuccessful offerors and is also the primary documents used to defend against protests. A member of the TEC will assist the Contracting Officer with debriefings.

**DACA31-99-R-0055**

**SSP-20**

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

#### 4.2 Evaluation Factors

Technical proposals will be evaluated based on the factors and sub-factors identified below. The Government shall evaluate the offerors' proposal in accordance with the **technical criteria extracted from Section 00100** of the solicitation document as identified in bold below.

##### 3.1.1 Past Performance and Relevant Experience

3.1.1.1 The Government will seek to determine, through investigation of the offeror's past performance, that the offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to customer satisfaction and timely delivery of quality construction.

The offeror shall provide performance evaluations on a minimum of four projects that are relevant in size and complexity and that were completed within the past five years. At a minimum, these projects shall have been 'satisfactorily' completed as indicated in the submitted performance evaluations. Submission of correspondence from previous project owners will suffice if performance evaluation forms are not available from the previous project owners. In the case of projects for government agencies, the offeror must submit that agency's performance evaluation forms. The offeror must identify all comments and ratings, as well as awards received for these projects. The offeror must provide references for each of these projects to include as a minimum the information as indicated on the form provided at the end of this section.

The above information is requested for the prime contractor and major subcontractors intended to be used in the performance of this work.

The technical evaluation team may contact the owner or authorized representative of the project. The Government may also use other tools such as CCASS ratings to gather information regarding an offeror's qualifications and past experience.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

3.1.1.2 The offeror's relevant experience will be evaluated based on the offeror's ability to execute the range of work required for this RFP. Specifically, it is anticipated that multiple delivery orders will be issued concurrently for various dollar amounts. The Government anticipates that the size, complexity and frequency of work will vary throughout the life of this contract. This evaluation will consider the contractor's ability to both provide construction efforts and to manage the work of multiple delivery orders at various installations throughout the specified region.

Relevant experience in the following elements is required to demonstrate minimum qualifications for the work of this RFP:

- a) Contract Sizes: range from \$500,000 to \$7,500,000
- b) Periods of Performance: Completed within the past five years
- c) Types of Construction: Minor repair, renovation and new construction. Specific types of construction include renovation, expansion and upgrade to existing facilities such as administrative offices, historic buildings, medical facilities, parking garages, tenant fit-out of office buildings, office park complexes, high school or college instructional structures, and/or combination office building with warehouse facilities. Multiple trade construction to include, but not limited to, any combination of the following typical construction trades: site clearing, building renovation, earthwork, site drainage and utilities, roads and walks, cast in place concrete, brick masonry, block and tile masonry, structural metal, metal joists and decking, rough carpentry, finish carpentry, built-in cabinetry and furniture, roofing and siding, sheet-metal work, doors, windows and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

glazing, window coverings, entrances and store fronts, lath and plaster, drywall, painting and wall coverings, floor tile and carpeting, pipe and fittings, plumbing devices and fixtures, fire extinguishing systems, fire alarm systems and intrusion detection systems and equipment, heating and air conditioning and ventilating equipment and systems, ducts and controls, boxes and wiring devices, starters, breaker panels, switching devices and transformers, lighting, primary and secondary power systems, asbestos abatement, lead-based paint abatement and environmental revitalization.

- d) Types of Contract: Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity, SABER, JOC, TOC or other multi-task types of contract, or traditional firm, fixed price construction contracts based on IFBs or RFPs.
- e) Level of Work: Contracts with a minimum of 20% of all work self-performed versus sub-contracted. The offeror must indicate in the project descriptions the extent of self-performed work by trade and dollar value.

The offeror shall use the form attached to the end of this section. In addition to the information requested above, offerors are encouraged to provide any supplemental information to assist the Government in developing confidence in the offeror's ability to complete this project on the basis of relevant experience.

4.6.1.1 Past Performance: The Government considers submissions that demonstrate satisfactory or higher performance ratings through the information submitted as meeting the minimum requirements of this RFP. Favorable consideration will be given to those proposals that provide documentation of performance that is above average or outstanding.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**4.6.1.2 Relevant Experience:** The Government considers submissions that demonstrates relevant experience consistent with that described in paragraph 3.1.1.2 as meeting the minimum requirements of this RFP. All of the requested information must be submitted in order to be considered as meeting the requirements of this RFP. Favorable consideration will be given to those proposals that demonstrate an extensive amount of experience in this size, complexity, type of contract and type of construction.

Use the following adjectival ratings/definitions:

**UNACCEPTABLE.** Any one or combination of the following:

(1) Offeror and/or critical team member does not demonstrate acceptable experience indicating their potential to satisfactorily perform work or manage (both technically and administratively) the work which is to be performed by a non identified subcontractor.

(2) Offeror's historic work load is not compatible with the new work load projected under the contract as tempered by the Offeror's plan (and capability) to distribute their work load within their team.

(3) Lack of commitment from critical identified subcontractors. The critical terms and conditions conflict with the stated intent of the identified subcontractor's mission.

**MARGINAL.** Any one or combination of the following:

(1) Offeror and/or critical team member has shown little experience indicating their potential to satisfactorily perform work or manage (both technically and administratively) the work which is to be performed by a non identified subcontractor.

(2) Offeror's historic work load is marginally compatible with the new work load projected under the contract as tempered by the Offeror's plan (and capability) to distribute their work load within their team.

(3) Incomplete or unclear commitment from critical identified subcontractors.



**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**SATISFACTORY.** Any one or combination of the following:

(1) Offeror and/or critical team member has demonstrated sufficient experience indicating their potential to satisfactorily perform work or manage (both technically and administratively) the work which is to be performed by a non identified subcontractor.

(2) Offeror's historic work load is compatible with the new work load projected under the contract as tempered by the Offeror's plan (and capability) to distribute their work load within their team.

(3) Satisfactory commitment from identified subcontractors. Terms and commitments do not appear to conflict with the stated intent of the identified subcontracted mission.

**VERY GOOD.** Any one or combination of the following:

(1) Offeror and/or critical team member demonstrated good experience indicating their potential to satisfactorily perform work or manage (both technically and administratively) the work which is to be performed by a non identified subcontractor.

(2) Offeror's historic work load is compatible with the new work load projected under the contract as tempered by the Offeror's plan (and capability) to distribute their work load within their team.

(3) Clear unambiguous commitment from all identified subcontractors. Terms and Commitment appear acceptable.

**EXCELLENT.** Any one or combination of the following:

(1) Offeror and/or critical team member demonstrated excellent experience indicating their potential to satisfactorily perform work or manage (both technically and administratively) the work which is to be performed by a non identified subcontractor.

(2) Offeror's historic work load is compatible with the new work load projected under the contract as tempered by the Offeror's plan (and capability) to distribute their work load within their team.

**DACA31-99-R-0055**

**SSP-25**

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

(3) Clear unambiguous commitment from all identified subcontractors. Terms and Commitment appear acceptable.

**3.1.2 Management Plan and Financial Capabilities**

**3.1.2.1 Management Plan**

The intent of the Management Plan is to assist the government in developing confidence in the offeror's ability to deliver a quality constructed facility in a safe and timely manner. The government is seeking contractors capable of performing multiple task orders at numerous locations concurrently. The number and value of task orders may range from a minimum demand, where the maximum value of the contract will not be achieved in the three year period, to the maximum demand, achieving the limit of the contract in the first year. The contractor must demonstrate the capability for planning, managing and performing multiple task orders to meet the maximum demand.

- a. Narrative: The offeror shall provide a narrative that describes the offeror's Management Plan to successfully execute this contract. Factors to include that will be considered in the evaluation are: quality of workmanship, scheduling capabilities, ability to manage a variable work load, home office staff (such as project management, estimating and scheduling resources), on-site or field staff, coordination with subcontractors and safety. The narrative must also address all phases of the construction process including the following: notification of scope, negotiating the delivery order, mobilization, commissioning and warranty response. Offerors are encouraged to elaborate on other factors that may assist the Government in developing confidence in the offeror's ability to perform the work of this contract.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

- b. Organization Chart: At a minimum, provide an organization chart showing the position and physical location of key personnel available to administer and manage the work of this contract. Identify all personnel and subcontractors included on the chart and clearly delineate on-site from off-site personnel. Indicate how the prime contractor and subcontractors interrelate and show the appropriate authority levels. Describe the home office organization's responsibilities and lines of authority. Describe your plan for managing subcontractor execution and administration.
- c. Key Personnel: Identify the proposed key personnel to manage and administer this contract. Include the individual's relevant experience and qualifications. At a minimum, the offeror must submit information for the proposed project managers, superintendents, quality control personnel and safety supervisors. Substitution of personnel proposed in this RFP will not be permitted unless approved by the Contracting Officer.

3.1.2.2 Financial Capabilities: Bonding capacity in the amount of \$7,500,000 is necessary in order to perform this contract. The offeror must submit verification from the surety indicating that the offeror meets this requirement. Submission of a recent audit (within the past three years) is necessary to determine the financial capability of the offeror. The audit shall clearly indicate the firm's gross annual volume and all indirect, general and administrative expenses. The information contained in this proposal shall not be used for purposes other than those identified herein. This information will not be released and the government understands that this information may be proprietary.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**4.6.2 Management Plan and Financial Capabilities**  
Submissions will be considered as meeting the minimum requirements of this RFP if all of the requested information is submitted. Specifically, the narrative must address the factors indicated in paragraph 3.1.2.1.a and all phases of the construction process. The organization chart and identification of key personnel are necessary in order to meet the requirements of this RFP. Favorable consideration will be given to those offers that demonstrate extensive experience in the management approach to indefinite delivery contracts. Favorable consideration will also be given for personnel with superior qualifications or personnel that demonstrate extensive construction experience in indefinite delivery contracting methods, quality control, project management, superintendence and safety.

Use the following adjectival ratings/definitions:

**UNACCEPTABLE.** Very low probability of acceptable performance because:

Offeror is clearly unable to provide a range of managerial requirements needed to deliver a product in a safe and timely manner through the use of his own resources and/or thru that of his identified subcontractor.

**MARGINAL.** Low probability of acceptable performance/best value because:

Offeror demonstrates a limited range of managerial requirements needed to deliver a product in a safe, and timely manner through the use of his own resources and/or thru those of his identified subcontractor. Major flaws in one or more of the management plan submittal criteria listed at Section 00100 Paragraph 3.1.2.1 a thru c limit confidence in the offerors ability to perform satisfactorily.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**SATISFACTORY.** Moderate probability of acceptable performance/best value because:

Offeror demonstrates an understanding of the managerial requirements needed to deliver a product in a safe and timely manner through the use of his own resources and/or thru those of his identified subcontractor. No major and only a few minor flaws in the management plan submittal criteria listed at Section 00100 Paragraph 3.1.2.1 a thru c are notable.

**VERY GOOD.** Good probability of highly acceptable performance/best value because:

Offeror demonstrates a good understanding of the managerial requirements needed to deliver a product in a safe, timely and cost efficient manner through the use of his own resources and/or thru those of his identified subcontractor. Only minor flaws in the management plan submittal criteria listed at Section 00100 Paragraph 3.1.2.1 a thru c are notable.

**EXCELLENT.** Excellent probability of a highly acceptable performance/best value because:

Offeror demonstrates an unquestionable understanding of the managerial requirements needed to deliver a product in a safe, timely and cost effective manner through the use of his own resources and/or thru those of his identified subcontractor. No flaws in the management plan submittal criteria listed at Section 00100 Paragraph 3.1.2.1 a thru c are notable.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**5.0 Best Value Approach**

**5.1 Value Method**

The best value approach results in award to the responsible offeror whose proposal is determined by the source selection authority to be overall most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. Unless all offers are rejected, award will be made to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is determined to be the best overall response, price and other factors considered. In determining the best overall response, technical superiority (including past performance, management and technical approach) will be the most important consideration; however, price will be a significant factor. The Government may select for award the offeror whose price is not necessarily the lowest, but whose technical proposal is more advantageous to the Government and warrants the additional price.

**6.0 Security of Source Selection Information**

**6.1 Restriction on Source Selection Participants**

Because participation in a source selection involves access to procurement sensitive information, it is essential that it be safeguarded in a manner similar to "classified" material. Participants in a source selection must accept and be willing to certify their acceptance of certain restrictions when nominated to serve on the SSEB. Participants shall not disclose proprietary or source selection information in accordance with FAR 3.104-5 and DFARS 203.10405.

Participants must avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interests. Participants will be required to understand and sign a Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure Statement and Rules of Conduct Certification.

**6.2 Document Control**

Proposals, the SSP and other material related to the source Selection will be closely controlled by the SSEB. When not in use all proposals and evaluation materials will be securely stored. Source selection materials will not be removed from the evaluation work location. Following contract award, proposals will be disposed of in accordance with established procedures.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

APPENDIX A  
SSEB MEMBER LISTING

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-31

Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Members**

Chairperson: Mary Wiedorfer, Construction Division

**Members**

Chairperson, TEC  
Chairperson, CEC  
Chairperson, SBEC  
Contract Specialist

**Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) Members**

Chairperson: Denita patterson, CO-CN

**Members:**

Glenn Morsey, Capital Area office  
Ben Hankins, Capital Area Office  
Mike Weedman, Bay Area Office  
Art Smit, CENAB-CO-SO

**Cost Evaluation Committee (CEC) Members**

Chairperson: Contracting Division Representative

**Members:**

Rich Seufert, CENAB-CO-CN

**Small Business Evaluation Committee (SBEC) Members**

Chairperson: Patricia Huber, Deputy for Small Business

**Members**

Penny Cincibus, CENAB-CT

**Advisors to the SSEB**

Office of Counsel  
Mary Wiedorfer, CENAB-CO-CN  
Pat Adams, Contracting Officer

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-32

**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**



APPENDIX B

CERTIFICATE FOR PERSONNEL PARTICIPATING IN  
SOURCE SELECTION CONCERNING NONDISCLOSURE,  
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST,  
AND RULES OF CONDUCT

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**CERTIFICATE FOR PERSONNEL PARTICIPATING IN SOURCE SELECTION  
CONCERNING NONDISCLOSURE, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST,  
AND RULES OF CONDUCT**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Organization:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Source Selection:** DACA31-99-R-0055, Multiple Award Task Order  
Construction Contract, Military District of  
Washington

1. I acknowledge that I have been selected to participate in the source selection identified above. I certify that I will not knowingly disclose any contractor bid or proposal or source selection information directly or indirectly to any person other than a person authorized by the head of the agency or the contracting officer to receive such information. I understand that unauthorized disclosure of such information may subject me to substantial administrative, civil and criminal penalties, including fines, imprisonment, and loss of employment under the Procurement Integrity Law or other applicable laws and regulations.

2. To the best of my knowledge, I certify that neither I nor my spouse nor my dependent children, nor members of my household, nor personnel with whom I am seeking employment have any direct or indirect financial interest in any of the firms submitting proposals, or their proposed subcontractors or have any other beneficial interest in such firm except as fully disclosed on an attachment to this certification.

3. I certify that I will observe the following rules of conduct:

a. I will not solicit or accept, directly or indirectly, any promise of future employment or business opportunity from, or engage, directly or indirectly, in any discussion of future employment or business opportunity with, any officer, employee, representative, agent, or consultant of a competing contractor.

**DACA31-99-R-0055**

**SSP-34**

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

b. I will not ask for, demand, exact, solicit, seek, accept, receive, or agree to receive, directly or indirectly, any money, gratuity, or other thing of value from any officer, employee, representative, agent, or consultant of any competing offeror for this acquisition. I will advise my family that the acceptance of any such gratuity may be imputed to me as a violation, and must therefore be avoided.

c. I will not discuss evaluation of source selection matters with any unauthorized individuals (including Government personnel), even after contract award, without specific prior approval from proper authority.

d. I understand that my obligations under this certification are of a continuing nature. If at any time during the source selection process, I receive a contract from a competing contractor concerning employment or other business opportunity, the offer of a gift from a competing contractor, or I encounter circumstances where my participation might result in a real, apparent, or potential conflict of interest, I will immediately seek the advice of an Ethics Counselor and report the circumstances to the Source Selection Authority.

I understand that making a false, fictitious, or fraudulent certification may subject me to prosecution under Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

APPENDIX C  
EVALUATOR'S SCORE SHEET

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-36

Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD**

**RATING SHEET**

OFFEROR: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_99

**VOLUME I: TECHNICAL**

**FACTOR: PAST PERFORMANCE AND RELEVANT EXPERIENCE**

**SUBFACTOR: 1. PAST PERFORMANCE:** Evaluate the Offeror's past performance to determine whether the offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to customer satisfaction and timely delivery of quality construction. Both Government and private industry performances will be given consideration in determining the Offeror's potential to perform satisfactorily under this contract.

RECOMMENDED QUALITATIVE RATING (Please Circle the Rating):

U 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 S 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 V 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 E

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

MARGINAL (M)

SATISFACTORY (S)

VERY GOOD (V)

EXCELLENT (E)

ADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:

DISADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:

QUESTIONS/REMARKS:

QUALITATIVE RATING (U, M, S, V, E) = \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEWER'S INITIALS

**\*\* NOTE: ALL RATINGS REQUIRE A COMPLETE JUSTIFICATION NARRATIVE.**

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-37

Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD**

**RATING SHEET**

OFFEROR: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE:   99  

**VOLUME I: TECHNICAL**

**FACTOR: PAST PERFORMANCE AND RELEVANT EXPERIENCE**

**SUBFACTOR: 2. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE:** Evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience to determine the potential to satisfactorily execute the range of work required for this RFP. Consider the offeror's ability to both provide construction efforts and to manage the work of multiple delivery orders at various installations throughout the specified region.

RECOMMENDED QUALITATIVE RATING (Please Circle the Rating):

U 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 S 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 V 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 E

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

MARGINAL (M)

SATISFACTORY (S)

VERY GOOD (V)

EXCELLENT (E)

ADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:

DISADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:

QUESTIONS/REMARKS:

QUALITATIVE RATING (U, M, S, V, E) = \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEWER'S INITIALS

**\*\* NOTE: ALL RATINGS REQUIRE A COMPLETE JUSTIFICATION NARRATIVE.**

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-38

Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD**

**RATING SHEET**

OFFEROR: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_99

**VOLUME I: TECHNICAL**

**FACTOR: MANAGEMENT PLAN AND FINANCIAL CAPABILITIES**

**SUBFACTOR: 1. MANAGEMENT PLAN: Evaluate the Offeror's ability to deliver a quality constructed facility in a safe and timely manner. Factors to consider include the Offeror's management plan to successfully execute this contract; the Offeror's organization chart showing the position and physical location of key personnel available to administer and manage the work of this contract; and the relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed key personnel to manage and administer this contract.**

**RECOMMENDED QUALITATIVE RATING (Please Circle the Rating):**

U 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 S 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 V 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 E

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

MARGINAL (M)

SATISFACTORY (S)

VERY GOOD (V)

EXCELLENT (E)

**ADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:**

**DISADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:**

**QUESTIONS/REMARKS:**

QUALITATIVE RATING (U, M, S, V, E) = \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEWER'S INITIALS

**\*\* NOTE: ALL RATINGS REQUIRE A COMPLETE JUSTIFICATION NARRATIVE.**

**DACA31-99-R-0055**

**SSP-39**

**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**  
**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET**  
**SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD**

**RATING SHEET**

OFFEROR: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_99

**VOLUME I: TECHNICAL**

**FACTOR: MANAGEMENT PLAN AND FINANCIAL CAPABILITIES**

**SUBFACTOR: 2. FINANCIAL CAPABILITIES:** Evaluate the Offeror's bonding capacity necessary to perform this contract. Evaluate the submitted audit to determine the financial capability of the offeror.

RECOMMENDED QUALITATIVE RATING (Please Circle the Rating):

U 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 S 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 V 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 E

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

MARGINAL (M)

SATISFACTORY (S)

VERY GOOD (V)

EXCELLENT (E)

ADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:

DISADVANTAGES OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN THIS AREA:

QUESTIONS/REMARKS:

QUALITATIVE RATING (U, M, S, V, E) = \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEWER'S INITIALS

**\*\* NOTE: ALL RATINGS REQUIRE A COMPLETE JUSTIFICATION NARRATIVE.**

DACA31-99-R-0055

SSP-40

**Source Selection Information - See FAR 3.104**